

313,159



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

AK

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/318,159	05/25/99	RHODES	H M4065.0335/P

NM92/1229
THOMAS J. D'AMICO, ESQ.
DICKSTEIN, SHAPIRO, MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP
2101 L STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON DC 20037-5599

EXAMINER	
MUNSON, G	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2811	15

DATE MAILED:
12/29/00

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) is extended to run _____ or continues to run THREE MONTHS from the date of the final rejection
- b) expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 15 DEC 2000, has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
 - a. There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - b. They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - c. They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - d. They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - e. They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

2. Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment will be entered will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: _____

However:

Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): _____

4. The ~~affidavit or exhibit~~ request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because ~~contrary to response (p. 2), page 3 of specification does not specify "another" dielectric other than grown or CVD silicon dioxide which are both silicon dioxide rather than "different" dielectric materials. Contrary to response (p. 3-4), applicant do not have an isolation trench instead as claimed.~~
5. The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented. ~~difficulty lies in the breadth of the claims which do not distinguish over subpartions of dielectric insulation regions and subpartion of a substrate (not isolated "region") in the references. All the references to have an isolation trench instead as claimed.~~

The proposed drawing correction has has not been approved by the examiner.

Other

Rene M. Munson
GENE M. MUNSON
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2881
U.S. GPO: 1997-417-381/62704